

## REMARKS

Claims 1-9 currently remain in the application. Claims 2, 4, 6 and 7 are herein amended.

In response to the document entitled Amendment "E" After Final Action mailed January 25, 2011, the Examiner stated in said Advisory Action that the proposed amendment therein would not be entered. The present RCE is therefore being submitted to have such amendment entered and to have consideration and/or search to be effected thereon. Thus, the claims section is herein amended in the same way presented in said Amendment "E" After Final Action and applicant is herein presenting the same argument as before against the Examiner's rejection in said Final Action. For the convenience of the Examiner, the argument presented in the REMARKS section of said Amendment "E" After Final Action is reproduced hereinbelow.

Regarding the matter of drawings in Paragraph 1 of the Official Letter, the examiner seems to be of the opinion that the drawings improperly fails to disclose any wheels which should be outside and connected to the inner frame, not in the inner frame as recited in claim 6. The Examiner is requested to note, however, that claim 6 says nothing specific regarding the position of the wheels except that "the running unit has wheels". Fig. 5 clearly discloses the running unit 30 as having the wheels 33, and hence it is believed that claim 6, which does not place any limitation on the position of the wheels with respect to the running unit need not be herein canceled.

Claims 1 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being anticipated by Narajowski. Rejection of a claim under 35 U.S.C. 102 is justified only when each of the inventive elements in that claim is disclosed in one reference. Narajowski does not clearly disclose every inventive element of independent claim 1, and hence it is believed that the Examiner's rejection of claim 1 is not justified and hence should be reversed.

Explained more in detail, Narajowski is not disclosing any structure anticipating the present invention. Narajowski's wheel shown at 55 in Fig. 7, for example, is for moving the blade 52 in one direction, not for causing carrier 11 or 12 to "run", and is not capable of running or rotating the wiping unit.

Applicant further argues that Narajowski's wheel assemblies 25 shown in Figs. 1 and 2

are not really running units. Narajowski discloses an embodiment comprising four wheel assemblies 25 (column 3, lines 67-68). These wheel assemblies 25 (Figs. 1 and 2) are each not a running unit in proper sense of the expression. Each of these four sets may individually rotate but they are not intended to serve to cause the running unit to rotate. Instead, Narajowski's wheel assemblies 25 are follower wheels for supporting the magnetic core 18 and maintaining a distance between the two carrier members (that is, the leader carrier 10 and the follower carrier 11) sandwiching the window pane W such that the window pane W can smoothly move and the follower carrier 11 can smoothly follow the leader carrier 10. In summary, Narajowski's wheels and the wheels according to the present invention have different intended roles to be performed, are differently structured, and function differently.

The Examiner is requested to additionally note that Narajowski is referring to a handle 13 (column 3, lines 18 and 23-24), suggesting that his unit is intended to be manually operated, not the kind of mechanism according to the present invention having an inner unit which is freely rotatable with respect to the outer frame.

Thus, it is believed that Narajowski is not capable of predicated the Examiner's rejection of claim 1 and that claim 9, dependent therefrom, should also be deemed allowable.

Claims 2-8 were found to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Although claim 1 is believed to be already in condition for allowance, as discussed above, claims 2-8 have been herein rewritten in independent form in order to expedite the prosecution. In summary, it is believed that the application is now in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Weaver Austin Villeneuve & Sampson LLP  
/kn/

Keiichi Nishimura  
Registration No. 29,093

February 18, 2011  
500 12th Street, Suite 200  
Oakland, California 94607  
Telephone: (510) 663-1100  
Telefax: (510) 663-0920